



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF RECENT CITY GROWTH: THE ERA OF SMALL INDUSTRIAL CENTRES

I.

When in 1898 New York City annexed the rural regions of Staten Island and the western end of Long Island, it afforded the jokers on the staffs of newspapers published near the foot of Lake Michigan and the mouth of the Delaware, opportunity for mirth anent the apprehensions of Father Knickerbocker for his title as premier among American cities. It certainly did seem curious that considerable bodies of citizens of the metropolis of the Western hemisphere should be farmers and dairymen, for one was not accustomed to salute the "hayseed" as a city man. And yet the consolidation was a typical instance of the expansion of American municipalities, and is finely illustrative of the gradual interpenetration of urban and rural life that is becoming increasingly characteristic of this country.

Herein lies the reason why the problem of the concentration of population has with us scarcely any of the national significance that attaches to it in the crowded countries of Europe. Our census statistics, indeed, revealed a steadily increasing concentration of population occasioned by the necessary growth of commerce and industry. In fact, American cities have grown even more rapidly than their European rivals, and by the very rapidity of their growth have created municipal problems that are now fairly well recognized. But these are almost entirely local problems and have not appeared in the domain of national politics. With the exception probably of the immigration problem, no phase of city growth has aroused discussion in the halls of the national legislature. On the other hand, we have lately observed in both Germany and England a heated discussion of the evils of city life that enlisted the talents of eminent economists and public men. In Germany, the fundamental argument of the Agrarian party for its policy of extreme Protectionism was based on the alleged devitalizing effects of city life upon the national strength and vigor; to preserve which, they maintained, agriculture, the mainstay of a vigorous soldiery, must be made more

profitable by means of high tariff duties. In England, national pride was touched to the quick by the decadence of its soldiery revealed in the successive reductions of the physical standards for recruits for the South African war. The decadence was all but universally attributed to city life, which has become the lot of the vast majority of the British masses.

In the United States it would require an unusually close observer to detect more than a trace of the fierce denunciation that in Germany and England has been heaped upon a public policy which allows the concentration of population, by migration from country to city, to go on unhindered. The obvious explanation of the different attitude which Americans assume towards the question is that concentration in this country has not reached the point where it threatens the national vigor; less than one-third of our population is concentrated in cities, while in England the proportion of city dwellers is two out of every three inhabitants. The explanation is, however, inadequate; for in Germany the proportion of urbanites is very little larger than that in the United States. The truer explanation is, that owing to the construction of American cities, urban life in this country is less destructive of bodily vigor than is the urban life of Europe. That is to say, the congestion of London, which in slightly lesser degree is reproduced in the other cities of Britain and Europe, is not characteristic of American urban centres. In 1890 the 28 leading cities of the United States housed 9,700,000 people on 638,000 acres, while 22 English cities housed nearly as many (8,800,000) on almost one-third the area (231,000 acres). The density of population in the American cities was 15 per acre, of the English cities 38 per acre, and of 15 principal German cities 25 per acre.¹ The contrast between Europe and America appears also in the following table of areas of a few metropolitan centres of nearly equal rank:

EUROPE		UNITED STATES	
City.	Acreage.	City.	Acreage.
London	74,692	New York	208,640
Paris	19,295	Chicago	102,765
Berlin	15,661	Philadelphia	82,807
Liverpool	5,210	St. Louis	39,276
Manchester	12,788	Boston	24,231

¹ Social Statistics of Cities, Eleventh Census, p. 14.

In each instance the European city has the larger population, while the American city has much the greater area. It is clear that "concentration of population" signifies something slightly different in the United States from what it means in Europe. Only in exceptional cases does it on this side of the ocean connote the congestion that gives English and Continental statesmen so much concern. The public papers of the chief executive of New York State have at times portrayed heartrending conditions in the tenement houses of New York City, but they have never assumed the tone of Lord Rosebery's address as chairman of the London County Council in 1891. "There is no thought of pride associated in my mind with the idea of London. . . . Sixty years ago a great Englishman, Cobbett, called it a wen. If it was a wen then, what is it now? A tumor, an elephantiasis sucking into its gorged system half the life and the blood and the bone of the rural districts."

And the recent investigations of Mr. Rowntree in the city of York have shown that London's poverty and helplessness are paralleled in the provincial cities of England.

II.

The crowding in European cities is a sign that mediævalism is not yet outgrown. Until modern times city and country were clearly separated one from the other,—and by walls of solid masonry. The classic words *urban* and *rural* emphasize the distinction,—the community walled in from the surrounding fields. The nineteenth century busied itself with developing the means of transportation that brought into the cities greater masses of business and population than the walls could contain; and the walls had to go down. But in Europe the improvement in transportation methods halted for a time before it had completed the destruction of the line between city and country. That line was still maintained by the necessity under which city people lived of being within easy reach of their work; they could not dwell out in the open country and carry on work in the city.

But in the United States the railroad had scarcely begun to build up large cities before it developed auxiliary lines which permitted the cities to expand over a wide territory. The horse-car, followed by the electric car, carried the workers from segregated

factories and shops to their detached houses. Hence the characteristic differences between the widely extended American city and the compact city of foreign countries that have been backward in establishing the newer means of locomotion. Hence in the United States, at the present time, one of the most embarrassing problems that confronts the statistician is to draw the line between urban and rural populations. What is the real distinction? The most obvious one is the fact of agglomeration, or grouping. A Massachusetts town (a territorial subdivision of the county) may have a population of 20,000 persons, and still be wholly agricultural and rural, if the town is large in area and the inhabitants dwell in isolated houses. But if some of them dwell in groups they form a community or agglomeration. Legally, the group becomes urban as soon as it is incorporated. But is an incorporated place of two or three hundred people a city? If not, how large a population must it have before we call it a city? The answer must be an arbitrary one, and as a matter of fact there is as yet no agreement among citizens or law-makers. In some parts of the country a place with a population of less than 2,000 is called a city. In New York the legislature rarely incorporates a city until it has a population of eight or ten thousand people. In Massachusetts the limit is still higher. Government statisticians at home and abroad are likewise unable to come to an agreement. Our own census authorities offer the alternatives of 2,500, 4,000, and 8,000, as the line of demarcation between urban and rural populations. For reasons elsewhere set forth,² the present writer prefers to draw the line at 10,000 and make a separate class of villages and towns under that limit, thus:

RURAL POPULATIONScattered.

VILLAGEIncorporated places with a population under 10,000.

URBAN { Incorporated places with a population of 10,000 or more.

LARGE CITY.Population of 100,000 or more.

The difference between a rural and a village population is easily recognized. The strictly rural population is scattered over the fields, as etymology indicates, and each household constitutes an economic unit,—even if the farm-houses be grouped together in hamlets as in

² In the 'Introduction to the "Growth of Cities."'

Europe. It is not until the hamlet becomes so thickly populated as to necessitate communal action for securing a supply of untainted water, disposing of wastes, and caring for streets, sidewalks, etc., that the "four-corners" post-office seeks incorporation as a village. Villagers are merchants and traders, hence do not belong to the rural population. And yet usage is essentially correct in classing the rural and village population together under the term "country" in opposition to "city;" for village life is homogeneous even as rural life is homogeneous. Every villager knows all of his fellow-villagers; and there is no escape from the domination of village opinion. It is only when the community becomes too large for every member to be his fellow-citizen's neighbor that the provincialism of rural life begins to break down and give place to the liberality of cities. The psychological effect of the mental freedom that is assured by cities to the individual swallowed up in the mass is far-reaching, but is too familiar to justify elaboration here. It will suffice to say that the statistical boundary line between village neighborliness and city independence seems to be fairly marked by the 10,000 population limit, as virtually recognized in the legislation of New York and other commonwealths. Finally the characteristics of city life appear so conspicuously in large cities that there is justification for the formation of a special class of cities of 100,000 population and upward. As a matter of fact, this is the only boundary line between municipalities that is uniformly recognized in the census reports of all governments. Abroad much of the current discussion of municipal problems is confined to cities of this class,—*die Grossstadt* of the Germans, *la grande ville* of the French.⁸

III.

The distribution of population in the United States within the several classes of communities described above is disclosed, as nearly as may be, in the following summary table:⁴

⁸ Cf. the monograph of Dr. Paul Meuriot, *Des Agglomérations Urbaines* (1897), and the collection of addresses delivered at the Dresden City Exposition in 1902; *Die Grosstadt* is the title of the collection, which includes the following papers: Bücher, *Large Cities in the Past and Present*; Ratzel, *The Geographical Situation of Large Cities*; v. Mayer, *The Population of the Large Cities*; Waentig, *The Economic Significance of the Large Cities*; Simmel, *The Large Cities and Mental Development*; Petermann, *The Spiritual Significance of the Large Cities*; Schaefer, *The Political and Military Significance of the Large Cities*.

⁴ Twelfth Census, vol. i. pp. lviii-lxxx.

		Number of Persons.		Percentage increase, 1890 to 1900.	Ratio of each class to whole population.	
		1890	1900		1890	1900
Country ...	{ Rural population ...	36,890,793	40,184,365	8.9	58.5	53
	{ Village population *	8,143,027	11,145,807	36.9	13.0	14
Total		45,033,820	51,330,172	13.9	71.5	67
City	{ Small city †	8,215,934	10,456,056	27.2	13.0	14
	{ Large city ‡	9,697,960	14,208,347	46.5	15.5	19
Total		17,913,894	24,664,403	43.3	28.5	33
United States		62,947,714	75,994,575	20.7	100	100

* Incorporated places having a population of less than 8,000.
† Incorporated places having a population of 8,000 to 100,000.
‡ Incorporated places having a population of more than 100,000.

At the latest census about one in five of all the persons enumerated in continental United States resided in the large cities. An additional 14 per cent. dwelt in small cities, thus bringing about one-third of the population into the class of city dwellers. Another 14 per cent. dwelt in villages, *i.e.*, incorporated places of less than 8,000, while somewhat more than one-half the population lived outside the cities and villages and constituted the strictly rural population.⁵ This country, it appears, cannot yet be grouped with the countries whose population is predominantly urban. At the preceding census, however, the rural population constituted a much larger proportion of the entire population; in 1890, the country districts contained 71.5 per cent. of the whole population. But of the 13,000,000 increase in the last decade, the country districts contributed not 71.5 per cent., but less than 50 per cent.,—in round numbers 6,300,000 as compared with a gain of 6,700,000 for the cities.

The decline of the rural population and the disproportionate increase of the city population cannot be attributed off-hand either to a larger excess of births in the cities or to the migration of countrymen into the cities. In a territory in which there was an increasing population but no migration whatever, and not a single city, we should see a relative decline in the rural population brought about by the growth of villages into cities. In 1890, the first year men-

⁵ The number would be somewhat diminished if the unincorporated communities within New England townships were to be classed with the similar, but incorporated, places of other States, in the urban group. The only incorporated places in Massachusetts are the cities, villages having no legal entity of their own.

tioned in the preceding table, there were only 28 large cities, while in 1900 there were 38 such cities. An increase in population no greater than that in the rural districts might have sufficed to raise the 10 additional cities from the lower to the higher class. Hence, in order to determine whether the cities do as a matter of fact grow more rapidly than the villages or country districts, it becomes necessary to institute a comparison between a definite number of cities, as below:⁶

Limits of population in 1900.		Number of towns.	Population.		Percentage increase.		
			1890	1900	1880-90	1890-1900	
Country:							
Rural, and places under 2,500		39,893,236	45,411,164	14.1	13.8	
Places, 2,500 to 4,000		704	1,619,308	2,211,019	44.4	36.5
“ 4,000 “ 8,000		612	2,524,986	3,380,193	45.8	33.9
City:							
Places, 8,000 to 25,000		385	4,029,929	5,273,887	51.2	30.9
“ 25,000 “ 100,000		122	4,177,671	5,509,965	59.3	31.9
“ 100,000 or more		38	10,702,584	14,208,347	46.0	32.8
United States		1,861	62,947,714	75,994,575	24.9	20.7

The table clearly shows that the rural districts had a very slow rate of increase in both decades, when compared with the urban rates of increase. The striking fact brought out in the table, however, is the remarkable growth of the villages and smaller cities in the last decade. In the decade 1880 to 1890 the most rapidly growing places were the 122 medium-sized cities (from 25,000 to 100,000 population in 1900), but since then the 704 towns or cities having a population in 1900 of 2,500 to 4,000 have wrested the lead away from the larger cities. Places over 4,000 have had a remarkably uniform rate of increase since 1890. Of the 38 large cities the decennial rate of increase was largest for the three great cities that have a population of more than 1,000,000, namely 38 per cent.; the next three largest cities (St. Louis, Boston, and Baltimore) averaged 23.3 per cent. increase; the five having a population of 300,000 to 500,000 (Cleveland, Buffalo, San Francisco, Cincinnati, and Pittsburg) averaged 27.6 per cent.; the eight in the class 200,000-300,000, 28.5 per cent.; and the remaining nineteen cities of 100,000 or more, 33.4 per cent. Of the 19 cities of 200,000 or upward only 6 (New York, Chicago,

⁶ Census Bulletin, No. 4 (1903), p. 32.

Cleveland, Buffalo, Detroit, and Milwaukee) had a higher rate of increase than the villages of from 2,500 to 4,000 inhabitants; and of the 19 cities of from 100,000 to 200,000 population, only eight.

It is a significant fact that five of the six most rapidly growing cities in the first class are situated on the Great Lakes, but one cannot venture an explanation of the causes of the growth of certain cities without further details. Below are listed all of the cities of 25,000 or more inhabitants which gained more than 60 per cent. in the last decade:

Rank as to rate of growth.	City.	Rank as to size.	Population.	Percentage in increase, 1890 to 1900.
1.....	South Omaha, Neb.	156
2.....	Butte, Mont.	133
3.....	Joplin, Mo.	155
4.....	Superior, Wis.	129	31,091	159.5
5.....	Newcastle, Pa.	144	28,339	144.3
6.....	Atlantic City, N. J.	149	27,838	113.2
7.....	Passaic, N. J.	150	27,777	113.2
8.....	Los Angeles, Cal.	36
9.....	St. Joseph, Mo.	34
10.....	East St. Louis, Ill.	137	29,655	95.5
11.....	Portland, Ore.	42
12.....	Seattle, Wash.	48
13.....	Spokane, Wash.	106
14.....	Easton, Pa.	160	25,238	74.3
15.....	Bayonne, N. J.	125	32,722	71.9
16.....	Honolulu, Hawaii	95
17.....	Chester, Pa.	119	33,398	68.0
18.....	Jacksonville, Fla.	143	28,429	65.3
19.....	South Bend, Ind.	110	35,999	65.0
20.....	McKeesport, Pa.	116	34,227	65.0
21.....	Johnstown, Pa.	112	35,936	64.8
22.....	York, Pa.	120	33,708	62.1
23.....	Houston, Tex.	85
24.....	Toledo, Ohio	26	131,822	61.9
25.....	Indianapolis, Ind.	21	169,164	60.4
26.....	Waterbury, Conn.	81	45,859	60.1
27.....	Duluth, Minn.	72	52,969	60.0

As the growth of cities in new territory is abnormally rapid, it seems hardly worth while to inquire further as to the causes of their growth, and the rates of increase of cities west of the Mississippi River have been omitted. They include 10 of the 27 most rapidly

growing municipalities having a population of 25,000 and upward. Of the remaining 17, nine are in Pennsylvania and New Jersey and are essentially manufacturing cities, with a population between the limits of 25,000 and 36,000. Most of the other cities in the list are industrial centres of about the same size, only two cities (Toledo and Indianapolis) having more than 60,000 inhabitants. There are eight more cities that gained more than 50 per cent. in population in 1890-1900, and nearly all are middle-sized industrial centres of New England and New York, Chicago (with a gain of 54.4 per cent.) being the only large city in the bunch. New York is not included, as its gain on the present territory was only 37 per cent. Nearly all of the Pennsylvania cities appearing in the foregoing list annexed some territory in the decade 1890-1900, but no extension of boundaries is recorded for the New Jersey cities.

The principal inference to be drawn from the comparison is that manufacturing industry no longer centres in the great commercial cities, but is developing smaller cities of its own. The inference is supported by the census of manufactures, which demonstrates that, whereas in the decade 1880-90 the number of factory wage-earners in the 100 principal cities increased at a rate far above the average, in the decade 1890 to 1900 the increase in these cities was only 14.2 per cent. as against a gain of 37.4 per cent. outside. Hence the share of the large cities in manufacturing industry has declined, as shown below :

	Population.		Wage Earners.		Value of Man'fd products.	
	1890	1900	1890	1900	1890	1900
100 large cities (more than 38,000 population each) ..	21.0	22.8	54.3	49.7	60.0	52.6
64 smaller cities (20,000- 38,000)	2.8	3.2	7.0	7.1	6.9	7.4
Remainder of United States	76.2	74.0	38.7	43.2	33.1	40.0
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
United States	100	100	100	100	100	100

The table clearly reveals the movement of manufacturing industry away from the large cities. The smaller cities barely held their own, while the substantial gains were in the places of less than 20,000 population. Unfortunately the available statistics do not permit of a classification of these smaller places, in respect of manu-

facturing development, but observers of industrial movements know that the real progress is in villages of from 2,000 to 10,000 population. Those who are familiar with the industries of New York City, for example, understand that innumerable large enterprises have been compelled by the pressure of high rents to move across the river into New Jersey, which, with Long Island, is becoming the factory quarter of the metropolis. The net result of this migration of industry in the last decade appears in the following table of rates of increase of the population of the different classes of cities, towns, and villages compiled from Professor Wilcox's Discussion of Increase of Population (Census Bulletin No. 4) :

Percentage rates of increase, 1890 to 1900, of different classes of cities and villages :

DIVISION.	100,000 and over.	25,000 to 100,000.	8,000 to 25,000.	4,000 to 8,000.	2,500 to 4,000.	Rural remainder.	Entire population.
New England	30.1	36.2	26.4	16.1	14.7	*2.0	19.0
N. Y., N. J., and Pa.	32.6	33.3	35.5	44.9	45.4	3.4	21.6
Northern South Atlantic ..	18.5	16.4	28.3	39.6	26.7	13.3	15.7
Southern " "	25.0	28.7	52.4	46.6	17.6	19.6
Eastern North Central	45.2	31.0	32.1	35.5	36.5	6.1	18.6
Western " "	21.9	24.5	20.7	17.4	31.9	13.4	15.8
Eastern South "	36.1	19.8	21.9	32.9	48.1	15.5	17.4
Western " "	18.6	34.2	38.5	66.1	84.3	37.5	37.8
Rocky Mountain	25.4	66.2	64.7	68.3	64.3	38.6	42.1
Utah, Nevada and Arizona	19.4	9.6	35.3	35.3	28.8	27.6
Cal., Ore., and Wash.	27.4	55.3	38.1	72.6	24.9	19.2	28.0
U. S.	32.8	31.9	30.9	33.9	36.5	13.8	20.7

* Decrease.

In all but two divisions of the country the highest rate of increase was in the village population (places with a population between 2,500 and 8,000). The exceptions were the eastern North Central States (Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin), in which the village growth was overshadowed by the wonderful development of the great ports on the Lakes, and the New England States, in which the population classed with the villages is largely rural owing to the fact that the large territorial division of the town was adopted by the statistician in the absence of incorporated villages

in the principal States of New England. The township containing only 2,500 to 8,000 inhabitants will seldom have any considerable village population,⁷ and for that reason the above-mentioned low rates of increase in New England are probably misleading. Conditions there are so similar to those in the other North Atlantic States that if the requisite data could be obtained they would doubtless reveal the same tendencies in the increase of the smaller places.

As fully 70 per cent. of the urban population of the United States is found in the geographic divisions of the North Atlantic and Eastern North Central States, the rates of increase in those divisions possess the greatest significance. At the same time it is interesting to note the remarkable development of villages in the Southern States, where the cotton manufacturing industry has made such rapid progress in recent years. Southern cotton factories are almost invariably located in small towns that are still in the village stage of development.

To recapitulate: The most rapid rate of increase of population in the United States is found in the villages or small towns (places with a population between 2,500 and 8,000), which are chiefly dependent for their prosperity upon manufacturing industry. The great cities—the centres of trade and commerce—nearly rival the villages in rate of growth. Moreover, the continual passage of villages into the ranks of small cities and of small cities into the class of large cities brings it about that an ever-increasing proportion of the people become residents of the larger cities, in which political and social problems are of commanding importance. In the light of these tendencies, what is to be the social policy of a well-governed commonwealth?

IV.

Until recent years statesmen assumed that the distribution of population was a matter to be left to itself,—*i.e.*, to the control of natural forces. This attitude was admirably set forth by the statesman-economist who is the present prime minister of Great Britain in a speech delivered in Parliament in December, 1893:

⁷ Thus the first two counties in New York, in their alphabetical order, yield the following contrasts: (1) Albany county—Bethlehem town, 4,226; Colonie town, 7,035; Coeyman town, 3,952, no villages; Green Island town, 4,770, village population, 4,770; Guilderland town, 3,530, village population, 689; New Scotland town, 3,058, village population, 554. (2) Allegany county—Wellsville town, 4,981, village population, 3,556.

"Do not let any member," he said, "suppose that if agriculture were as prosperous now as it was twenty years ago, or as the dreams of the greatest dreamer of dreams would make it, you could by any possibility stop this emigration from the country. It depends upon causes and natural laws which no laws we can pass can permanently modify. The plain fact is that in a rural district there is and can be only one investment for capital and only one employment for labor. When prosperity in agriculture increases, immigration into towns diminishes, no doubt; but however prosperous agriculture may be, a normal point must be reached when no more capital can be applied to the land and no more labor can be applied, and when you have reached that point it does of necessity happen that if marriages occur with the frequency with which they occur at the present time, and if families are as large as they are at the present time, there must be an emigration from the country to the town, from the place where there is only one kind of employment of labor, strictly limited by the natural capacity of the soil, to another place where there is no limit whatever to the employment of labor, except the limit set by the amount of capital seeking investment and the amount of labor capable of taking advantage of that capital."

With the premises assumed, no fault can be found in a policy of *laissez-faire* based on the foregoing argument. But the speaker failed to understand the natural forces that even as he spoke were transferring a branch of industry co-ordinate with agriculture from the large cities to villages and small places with only semi-urban characteristics. With a well-developed system of transportation, large factories will avoid the high rents of commercial centres and seek thinly populated localities. Herein lies the opportunity of progressive statesmanship for planning a healthy environment of the industrial population. Instead of permitting cities to grow up haphazard, following the lines marked out by cow-paths (and in after years rectifying the mistake by enormous expenditures for wider and straighter streets or underground subways, as Paris, Boston, and other great cities have done), the men who plan the Pullmans, Wilmerdings, Schenectadys, Solvays, and greater cities of the future will demand the latest word of science regarding the proper disposition of streets, parks, factories, houses, and stores for the procurement of unlimited amounts of light and air. We have learned that the packing of human beings into tenement barracks devoid of

light and air is not due to the necessity of any natural law, but to the greed of man. The city, even the largest city, can now be made as healthful as the country, because cheap rapid transit enables city workers to live many miles away from their work-places.

To make transit cheap as well as rapid requires, however, a strict control of franchise privileges by the public authorities. *Laissez-faire* is wholly out of place in modern civic policy. In contrast with Mr. Balfour's views may be recorded the more modern attitude as described by Dr. Albert Shaw:

"The present evils of city life are temporary and remediable. The abolition of the slums and the destruction of their virus are as feasible as the drainage of a swamp and the total dissipation of its miasmas. The conditions and circumstances that surround the lives of the masses of people in modern cities can be so adjusted to their needs as to result in the highest development of the race, in body, in mind, and in moral character. The so-called problems of the modern city are but the various phases of the one main question, How can the environment be most perfectly adapted to the welfare of urban populations? And science can meet and answer every one of these problems."

These words occur in the introduction of an extended account of the ways in which British cities are adjusting environment to needs instead of permitting environment to determine the conditions of life.⁸ Since they were written, municipal co-operation has won great triumphs in England, but the greatest triumph of all seems to be in store for the "Garden Cities" planned by Ebenezer Howard, a prominent London stenographer. It is several years since Mr. Howard set forth his plan in a little book entitled "To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform."⁹ The scheme is a combination of three ideas made familiar by other writers. An organized migratory movement of population (Wakefield); the system of land tenure first proposed by Thos. Spence; and the design of a model city. The essence of the scheme is the acquisition of an advantageous location for factories in the open country or on a village site, by a trust formed to hold the title of the land until the town has been laid out and factories started by the inducement of low rents. Later the title

⁸ Shaw, *Municipal Government in Great Britain*, p. 3.

⁹ London: Sonnenschein & Co., 1898. Later editions were entitled "Garden Cities of To-Morrow."

to the land is transferred to the community, the aim thus being to preserve to the city as a whole the unearned increment due to the mere growth of the city. Already has the Garden City Pioneer Association been formed with a distinguished list of members and with stock subscriptions aggregating \$100,000.* If the experiment should succeed in abolishing ground-rents and appropriating to the communal treasury the increase in land values, it would open unlimited possibilities for the reconstruction of urban centres. Even if that feature should not prove wholly successful, Mr. Howard's plan of a model city (in circular instead of rectangular form, with the public buildings in the centre and streets radiating to the circumference, where the factories are located) will have become familiar and will provoke imitation on account of its success in combining the advantages of the city and the country, so well described by Emerson long ago:

"A man should live in or near a large town, because, let his own genius be what it may, it will repel quite as much of agreeable and valuable talent as it draws, and, in a city, the total attraction of all the citizens is sure to conquer, first or last, every repulsion, and drag the most improbable hermit within its walls some day in the year. In town he can find the swimming-school, the gymnasium, the dancing-master, the shooting-gallery, opera, theatre, and panorama; the chemist's shop, the museum of natural history; the gallery of fine arts; the national orators, in their turn; foreign travellers, the libraries, and his club. In the country he can find solitude and reading, manly labor, cheap living, and his old shoes; moors for game, hills for geology, and groves for devotion."

ADNA FERRIN WEBER.

New York State Department of Labor, Albany, N. Y.